

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated October 18, 2007, issued in connection with the above-identified application. A petition for a one-month extension of time accompanies this Amendment. Claims 1-11 were previously pending in the application. With this Amendment, claims 1-11 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein; and claims 12-24 have been added. No new matter has been introduced by the new claims.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner made the following prior art rejections to the claims: claims 1, 2, 7, 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Derango et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,120,147, hereafter “Derango”) in view of Parmar et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0023711, hereafter “Parmar”); claims 3 and 4 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Derango in view of Parmar, and further in view of Vaid et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,101, hereafter “Vaid”); claims 6, 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Derango in view of Parmar, and further in view of Chawla et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,876,668, hereafter “Chawla”); and claim 5 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Derango in view of Parmar, and further in view of Vaid and Chawla.

As noted above, the Applicants have canceled claims 1-11 rendering the rejections to those claims moot. Additionally, the Applicants maintain that new claims 12-24 are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

For example, independent claim 12 recites the following:

“A resource management server for managing resources for a plurality of electronic equipment classified into groups according to functions of the plurality of electronic equipment, the resource management server comprising:

at least one processor; and

a memory, wherein the at least one processor executes resource management

functions including:...

a receiving function of receiving second group information and resource reservation-requesting information from a second electronic equipment newly connected to the transmission apparatus, the second group information defining a group to which a function of the second electronic equipment belongs, the resource reservation-requesting information including information with respect to a bandwidth requested by the second electronic equipment;

a group-judging function of judging, based on the first group information and the second group information, whether or not the second electronic equipment belongs to the same group as the first electronic equipment when the receiving function receives the second group information; and

a path-judging function of judging, based on the reservation status information and the resource reservation-requesting information, whether or not a communication path between the first electronic equipment and the second electronic equipment is available when the group-judging function judges that the second electronic equipment belongs to the same group as the first electronic equipment.”

These features noted above in independent claim 12 are similarly recited in independent claims 23 and 24. Specifically, claim 23 is directed to a corresponding method claim, and claim 24 is directed to a corresponding program claim; both of which include the features of the “receiving function,” “group-judging function,” and “path-judging function” noted above in claim 12.

The Applicants maintain that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of the “receiving function,” “group-judging function,” and “path-judging function” of independent claims 1, 23 and 24.

Specifically, Derango is directed to a call control method in a multi-zone, packet-based communication system that uses a reservation proxy function. In Derango, the communication system includes base sites organized in respective zones (e.g., zone 1-

zone 4). The base sites include base stations for communication with wireless units in respective coverage areas, which are logically coupled to each other via router elements associated with the respective zones.

As described in Derango, a base station desiring to receive data packets, sends Internet Group Management Protocol (IGMP) Join Messages to their attached router. The router, in turn, creates a spanning tree of router interfaces for distributing data packets (see e.g., col. 4, lines 57-60). Derango also discloses the use of an RSVP protocol that includes the use of three different types of messages for achieving a specific type of data flow: 1) Wildcard Filter (WF); 2) Shared Explicit (SE); and 3) Fixed Filter (FF) (see e.g., col. 5, line 59-col. 6, line 21).

However, Derango, fails to disclose or suggest the following features recited in independent claims 12, 23 and 24:

- 1) receiving second group information and resource reservation-requesting information from a second electronic equipment newly connected to the transmission apparatus, the second group information defining a group to which the second electronic equipment belongs, the resource reservation-requesting information including information with respect to a bandwidth requested by the second electronic equipment;
- 2) judging, based on the first group information and the second group information, whether or not the second electronic equipment belongs to the same group as the first electronic equipment when the receiving function receives the second group information; and
- 3) judging, based on the reservation status information and the resource reservation-requesting information, whether or not a communication path between the first electronic equipment and the second electronic equipment is available when the group-judging function judges that the second electronic equipment belongs to the same group as the first

electronic equipment.

Moreover, Parmer, Vaid and Chawla (individually or in combination) fail to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Derango. That is, Parmer, Vaid and Chawla (individually or in combination) fail to disclose or suggest the “receiving function,” “group-judging function,” and “path-judging function” of independent claims 12, 23 and 24.

Specifically, Parmar merely discloses a policy based network management (PBNM) system that is used to identify one or more policies associated with a network component (e.g., a network device, a device group, a device subgroup, a user, an application, or end-host). More specifically, the system identifies one or more policies directly associated with a network component, generates a list of one or more groups to which the network component belong; and identifies one or more policies associated with each of the groups in the generated list (see e.g., Abstract).

Vaid discloses a method for monitoring or profiling quality of service for one or more information sources in a network of computers. As described in Vaid, a network of computers is coupled to each other, and to a local area network. Additionally, a firewall server is coupled to the network of computers, and a distributed traffic management tool is coupled to the firewall server for achieving traffic monitoring or profiling of incoming and outgoing information from information sources (see e.g., Abstract).

Finally, Chawala discloses a system capable of dynamically reserving bandwidth and adjusting bandwidth reservations for active sessions of data communication in a data communications device. As described in Chawala, the system accepts requests to allocate or reserve bandwidth using bandwidth reservation protocols such as RSVP (see e.g., Abstract).

As noted above, nothing in Parmer, Vaid and Chawla (individually or in combination) disclose or suggest the features of the “receiving function,” “group-judging function,” and “path-judging function” of claims 1, 23 and 24.

The present invention, on the other hand, provides a receiving function, a group-judging function, and the path-judging function that enables the determination of a communication path in synchronization with connecting electronic equipment to a transmission apparatus by considering the group to which the electronic belongs and the available bandwidth.

Accordingly, independent claims 12, 23 and 24 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited prior art. Likewise, dependent claims 13-22 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited prior art based at least on their dependency from independent claim 12.

In view of the above remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and the Examiner is requested to pass the case to issue. If the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Yuichi KAWAGUCHI et al.

By:


Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP(DMO)/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
February 19, 2008